

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
FORT WAYNE DIVISION**

JESSICA M. FARLOW for A.R.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 1:24-cv-331-HAB
)	
BRADLEY CROZIER, SHANNON FREEMAN, CRYSTAL MILLER, CITY OF FORT WAYNE, and FORT WAYNE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS)	
)	
Defendants,)	
)	

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s second request for extension of time to respond to Defendants’ motions for summary judgment (ECF No. 38). Although Plaintiff’s motion indicates that it is unopposed, the motion presents several problems which gives this Court a moment of pause. This is Plaintiff’s second request for an extension, and it is word-for-word the same as her first request (ECF No. 36). Plaintiff’s second request thus utterly fails to accurately represent the record. For example, it states that Plaintiff’s response is due in May 2025 while the Court has already granted Plaintiff until June 16, 2025, to respond; “Plaintiff requests that she have until June 16th, 2025, by which to file a joint response[,]”¹ the same day that she filed her second request; and the motion indicates that “this is the first request for extension of time made by Plaintiff” while it is the second. With these inaccuracies in mind, the Court simply cannot grant

¹ Although the body of the motion requests “an additional 30 days, or by June 16th, 2025, by which to file a joint response to both Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment[,]” Plaintiff explicitly requests until June 16, 2025 in her conclusion.

Plaintiff's second request for an extension of time. At minimum, Plaintiff's motion should accurately reflect the record and actually request an extension.

For these reasons, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Second Request for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 38) with leave to refile.

SO ORDERED on June 17, 2025.

s/ Holly A. Brady

CHIEF JUDGE HOLLY A. BRADY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT